

REMARKS

Claims 1–6, 9–16, 19–30 and 37–42 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 11, 22 and 24–30 are amended, and new Claims 37–42 are added. Claims 7–8, 17–18 and 31–36 were previously canceled.

New Claims 37–42 are fully supported by the originally filed application. See, for example, the originally filed application at numbered paragraphs [0003], [0005], [0028], [0029], and [0031].

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1–6, 9–16 and 19–30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over He (US Publication No. 2004/0,118,916) in view of Maynard (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,335). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

He captures an image of an object and captures an ID (identification) from an RFID tag, and consults a database to determine whether the object and the ID match. If they do match, then the ID identifies the object in the captured image. If they don't match, then the ID identifies a different object than the (mystery) object in the captured image, and the object in the captured image remains un-identified. Thus He either identifies the object in the captured image or identifies a different object not shown in the captured image. See, for example, He's Abstract, He's numbered paragraphs [0008], [0049], [0061], [0062], and He's Claim 1.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, He fails to disclose or suggest disclose or suggest identifying two objects in an image, as variously encompassed by the independent claims, and fails to disclose or suggest "*identifying a second object in the image using a library of potential*

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Application Filing Date: September 10, 2003

matches narrowed based upon the first identifier of the first object, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier", as recited for example in Claim 1.

The Examiner cites Maynard as disclosing these features, but Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Maynard discloses in Figure 3 an RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) tag 20 includes both tag data 34 that identifies the tag, and also asset data 36 that identifies an asset to which the RFID tag 20 is attached. The Examiner also cites Maynard at column 4, lines 42-60 (C4/L42-60) which further discloses that the RFID tag has first and second data storage areas, and data uniquely identifying the tag is written into the first area and data describing and identifying an asset (such as a piece of computer equipment) is written into the second area. As shown in Figure 3, the RFID tag can include a third area for security data.

The Examiner appears to be considering Maynard's RFID tag as corresponding to Applicant's claimed first object, and the asset identified in the second data storage area of the RFID tag (to which the RFID tag is presumably attached) as corresponding to Applicant's claimed second object. The Examiner also appears to be considering Maynard's second data storage area with information identifying the asset, as corresponding to the "*library of potential matches*" recited in each of Applicant's independent Claims 1, 11 and 21.

But, Maynard's RFID tag identifies only one asset, and therefore fails to disclose or suggest *multiple* possible matches. In addition, Maynard's second data storage area is not narrowed based on the RFID identification in the first data storage area of the RFID tag. Accordingly, the asserted combination of He and Maynard fails to disclose or suggest "*identifying a second object in the image using a library of potential **matches** narrowed based*

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Application Filing Date: September 10, 2003

upon the first identifier of the first object, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier” as recited in Claim 1, and likewise fails to disclose or suggest the similar features of a) “a computer program product encoding a computer program that when executed on a computer system causes the computer system to perform a computer process, the computer process comprising ... identifying a second object in the image using a library of potential matches narrowed based upon the first identifier of the first object, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier”, as recited in independent Claim 11, and b) “an identifying module configured to identify a second object in the image using a library of potential matches narrowed based upon the first identifier of the first object, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier”, as recited in independent Claim 21.

The dependent claims depend variously from allowable independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, and are therefore likewise allowable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, with respect to dependent Claims 37, 39 and 41, Applicant notes that Maynard’s RFID tag identifies both the tag, and an asset to which the tag is associated and/or attached. Accordingly, He and Maynard both fail to disclose or suggest that *“the first object does not identify the second object”*, as recited in dependent Claims 37, 39 and 41.

In addition, with respect to dependent Claims 38, 40 and 42, Applicant notes that both Maynard and He fail to disclose or suggest identifying the second object using image recognition, as variously encompassed by the present claims. In particular, both He and Maynard fail to disclose or suggest *“wherein the library of potential matches comprises visual image models, and the identifying the second object comprises comparing the visual image models with the captured image to identify the second object”* as recited in Claim 38, and similar features recited in Claims 40 and 42.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Application Filing Date: September 10, 2003

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6, 9-16 and 19-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over He in view of Maynard is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration on the merits and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. In the event any questions arise regarding this communication or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Application Filing Date: September 10, 2003

